

**MINUTES OF THE 42<sup>nd</sup> MEETING OF SEAC, KERALA  
HELD ON 2<sup>nd</sup> JULY, 2015,  
AT SP GRAND DAYS HOTEL, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM**

The 42<sup>nd</sup> meeting of the SEAC commenced at 9.30 AM with Sri. V. Gopinathan, in the chair. The Chairman welcomed the members and initiated the proceedings of the Committee.

**Item No.42.00                      Consideration and approval of Minutes and Appraisal Reports**

The Minutes and the Appraisal reports of the 41<sup>st</sup> meeting held on 16<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup> June, 2015 were formally approved by the Committee.

**Item No.42.01                      Application for environmental clearance for the Proposed Group Construction Project of Educuity in Ward No. IX, R.S. No. 395, 397/2 of Pookkottur Panchayath and in Ward No. III, R.S. No. 137/1, 137/2, 137/3, 138, 139/1A, 139/1B, 139/2, 139/3A, 139/3B, 140/1, 140/2, 141/1A, 141/2A, 141/2B, 141/2C, 142/1, 142/2A, 142/2B, 144/1, 144/2A, 144/2B, 144/3A, 144/3B, 144/4A1, 144/4A2, 144/4B, 145/1A1, 145/1A2, 145/1B1, 145/1B2, 145/2, 145/2B, 145/3, 145/4, 145/5, 145/6A, 145/6B, 146/2A, 146/2B of Malappuram Municipality, at Melmuri Village & Pookkottur Village, Malappuram District, Kerala by M/s Al Abeer Educuity. (File No. 106/SEIAA/KL/1722/2013)**

**Project Proponent                      :**        Mr. Alungal Mohammed  
**EIA Consultant                        :**        M/s en-vision Enviro Engineers Pvt.Ltd.

The 39<sup>th</sup> SEAC considered and appraised the proposal on the basis of the notification No. S.O.3252 (E) dated 22.12.2014 and decided to recommend to close further action since EC is not required for educational institution as per above said OM.

In view of the OM F No. 19-2/2013-IA III dated 9-06-2015, the Committee reviewed the decision taken in its 39<sup>th</sup> meeting. The hospital building included in the proposal is having a total built up area of 45,715.18m<sup>2</sup> (hospital) + 13092.31m<sup>2</sup> (super speciality hospital). The proposal in totality was already recommended for issuance of EC by the Committee in its 25<sup>th</sup> meeting. However SEIAA had suggested having an independent biomedical waste management facility for the project. The proponent has already communicated details of the management of medical waste as is being adopted by other hospitals.

In the light of the above, the Committee decided to endorse the decision taken in its 25<sup>th</sup> meeting **for issuance of EC** under usual general conditions for non-mining projects and the following specific condition.

1. Two seats to be reserved for eligible students of BPL family for free education for MBBS as agreed in the CSR component.

**The appraisal report is enclosed as Annexure 1**

**Item No.42.02**      **Environmental clearance for the proposed Medical Trust Institute of Medical Sciences project in Sy. Nos. 188/2, 3, 5, 189/1, 2,3,4,5,6,190/1, 2,3,198/4, 199/2, 3,4,5,7, 200/5, 7, 12, 201/1, 2, 12, 202/24 at Thiruvankulam Village, Kanayannur Taluk, Ernakulam District, Kerala by M/s Pulikkal Medical Foundation**  
(File No. 143/SEIAA/KL/2744/2013)

Project Proponent : Sri. P.V. Antony  
EIA Consultant : Environmental Engineers and Consultants Pvt. Ltd.

The 40<sup>th</sup> SEAC considered and appraised the proposal on the basis of the notification No. S.O.3252 (E) dated 22.12.2014 and decided to recommend to close further action since EC is not required for educational institution as per above said OM.

In view of the OM F No. 19-2/2013-IA III dated 9-06-2015 the Committee reviewed the decision taken in its 40<sup>th</sup> meeting. The total built up area of the hospital building is 8621.32m<sup>2</sup> (MC block 1) + 18860.08 m<sup>2</sup> (MC block 2). Therefore the Committee decided to endorse the decision taken in its 30<sup>th</sup> meeting **for issuance of EC** stipulating the following specific conditions in addition to the general conditions for non-mining projects.

1. A buffer distance of at least 10 m to be kept as No Development Zone on the side of the thodu.
2. No part of the streams in the site should be reclaimed.
3. The hierarchy of width of internal roads must be maintained.

The Committee also decided to intimate SEIAA that as per the letter No. H3-13188/2013 dated 19.9.2013 of the Additional Tahasildar, Kanayannur, furnished along with the original application, the land in question is already a filled up land as on the date of commencement of *Kerala Conservation of Paddy Land and Wetland Act, 2008*. Hence it does not come under the purview of the above said act. Moreover, if necessary, it is the responsibility of the Local Body to obtain the prior clearance under the above Act before according the building permit.

**The appraisal report is enclosed as Annexure 2**

**Item No.42.03**      **Environmental Clearance for Commercial Complex project in Sy. Nos. 4/18-3, 6/19-2, 6/9-3, 5/3 pt., 6/1-2, 4/14, 6/6-2, 6/1-2-3, 6/7-2-2, 6/5-2, 6/5, 6/12-2, 4/18-2, 6/19-2, 6/9-2, 4/17, 4/20, 7/1-3, 6/10, 6/11, 6/8, 7/1-4, 4/16, 4/19-2 and 4/15 at Aluva West Village, Choornikkara Panchayath, Aluva Taluk, Ernakulam District, Kerala by P.C. Thahir**

(File No. 270/SEIAA/KL/1223/2014)

Project Proponent : Sri. P.C. Thahir  
EIA Consultant : Environmental Engineers and Consultants Pvt. Ltd.

The Committee reviewed its decision taken in its 40<sup>th</sup> meeting in the light of the amendments to Para (3) of appendix V of 2006 notification issued vide MoEF notification S.O. 3067 dated 01.12.2009 which reads 'Where a public consultation is not mandatory, the appraisal shall be made on the basis of the prescribed application Form I and EIA report, in case of all projects and activities other than item 8 of the schedule. In the case of Item 8 of the

*Minutes for the 42<sup>nd</sup> SEAC meeting held on 2<sup>nd</sup> July, 2015*

Schedule, considering its unique project cycle, the EAC or SEAC concerned shall appraise all Category B projects or activities on the basis of Form 1, Form 1A and the conceptual plan and make recommendations on the project regarding grant of EC or otherwise and also stipulate the conditions for EC”

In the light of the above the Committee decided to **recommend for issuance of EC** stipulating the following specific conditions in addition to the general conditions for non-mining projects.

1. The storm water drain in the plot and its connection to the drain outside is not clear. Being a waterlogged site, a clear storm water management plan shall be provided.
2. Separate entry and exit should be provided such that the traffic in NH is unhindered.
3. Adequate precautions for disaster management should be inbuilt in the plan.
4. Carbon foot print of the project should be reduced to the maximum extent possible.

**The appraisal report is enclosed as Annexure 3**

**Item No.42.04 Environmental clearance for the residential project (“Marine View at Marine Drive”) at Plot No. D4 & D5 in Sy. No. 843 pt. at Ernakulam Village, Kochi Municipal Corporation, Kanayannur Taluk, Ernakulam District, by M/s Puravankara Projects Limited (File No. 275/SEIAA/KL/1278/2014)**

Project Proponent : Sri. Ranjit Thomas  
EIA Consultant : Environmental Engineers and Consultants Pvt. Ltd.

In view of the amendment to Para (3) of appendix V of 2006 notification issued vide SO 3067 dtd 1.12.2009 the Committee reviewed its decision taken in its 40<sup>th</sup> meeting. During the course, the Committee noted the observation of SEIAA in its 35<sup>th</sup> meeting which reads-

“SEAC in its 35<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 17/18-9-2014, recommended for grant of EC subject to three specific conditions, which do not include CRZ clearance though the site is in Marine Drive, Kochi. The meeting decided that the E.C shall be the final step before issue of which all the other statutory permits, consents and clearances shall be obtained. Proponents should obtain all other clearances required before applying for E.C. Site verification is mandatory for all high-rise building projects. The Authority wanted to have the veracity of the statements in item 2 of the Appraisal report on non- CRZ status of the site based on a 1998 judgment of the High Court where as the extant CRZ notification is of 2011.

Also the Government order from The Local Self government Department stating that the land assigned to GCDA will not fall within CRZ needs to be verified. The case is referred back to SEAC for further verification of the above aspects and to confirm the non- CRZ status of the land”

The Committee is of the view that the above observation of SEIAA is not in consonance with the provisions contained in para 8(V) of 2006 notification of MoEF which states that

“Clearances from other regulatory bodies or authorities shall not be required prior to receipt of applications for prior environmental clearance of projects or activities, or screening, or scoping, or appraisal, or decision by the regulatory authority concerned, unless any of these

is sequentially dependent on such clearance either due to a requirement of law, or for necessary technical reasons’.

With regards to the site inspection it is left to SEAC to decide whether a site inspection is essential for proper appraisal of a proposal as is detailed in 7 stage (2) scoping of 2006 EIA notification 14.09.2006 which further states that ‘..... a site visit by a sub- group of Expert Appraisal Committee or State level Expert Appraisal Committee concerned only if considered necessary by the Expert Appraisal Committee or State Level Expert Appraisal Committee concerned, Terms of Reference suggested by the applicant if furnished and other information that may be available with the Expert Appraisal Committee or State Level Expert Appraisal Committee concerned .....’

In the case of CRZ area, as per the Para4(d) of the CRZ notification on 6.01.11 prior recommendations of the CZMA is required for according EC.

With respect to the veracity of the exemption of the land of the applicant from CRZ notification 2011, it is observed from the file that Member Secretary (i/c) KCZMA has already clarified the issue to the Member Secretary, SEIAA vide Letter No. 3207/A2/15/KCZMA/S&TD dated 9/06/2015 and in such cases KCZMA is the final authority to advise regarding the applicability of CRZ notification to a particular area.

Further the Committee observed that the proponent has stated in Form I that the project site is located within 1 KM radius from Mangalavanam Bird Sanctuary which is a notified protected area under Wildlife Protection Act, 1972. In such cases the procedure to be adopted are detailed in OM dt 02.12.2009 amended on 03.03.2015. As per the amended OM, the procedure to be adopted is that the project proponent should submit a copy of the application submitted for wildlife clearance with all its enclosure, along with the environment clearance application. The proponent has not done so.

Considering all the aspects, the Committee decided to **recommend to issue EC** as decided in its 35<sup>th</sup> meeting of SEAC subject to following special conditions **on production of the copy of application preferred for seeking Wildlife Clearance from the Standing Committee of NBWL.**

1. The access, parking facility, and setbacks shall be in accordance with the National Building Code.
2. The concentrated rejects of R.O. Plant must be sufficiently diluted with treated effluent water meant for recycling before it is let out.
3. Adequate precautions for disaster management should be inbuilt in the plan.
4. Carbon foot print of the project should be reduced to the maximum extent possible.

**The appraisal report is enclosed as Annexure 4**

**Item No.42.05**      **Environmental clearances for the Residential Apartment project in Sy. Nos. 193/24A and 24B at Edappally South Village, Kochi Corporation, Kanayannur Taluk, Ernakulam District, Kerala by Elko Properties & Developers Pvt. Ltd. & ABZ Skyline Properties Pvt. Ltd.**

(File No. 299/SEIAA/KL/1499/2014)

Project Proponent : Sri. Sajith K  
EIA Consultant : Environmental Engineers and Consultants Pvt. Ltd.

In view of the amendment to Para (3) of appendix V of 2006 notification issued vide S.O. 3067 dtd 1.12.2009; the Committee reviewed its decision taken in its 40<sup>th</sup> meeting.

On Verification of the concerned Maps, the Committee found that the proposed area doesn't fall under CRZ. In such matters KCZMA is the authority for final clarification. In this particular case, the Committee observed that the CRZ status will not have any bearing on the appraisal.

After discussion the Committee decided to endorse the decision taken in its 35<sup>th</sup> meeting of SEAC for **issuance of EC** subject to general conditions for non-mining projects in addition to following specific conditions.

1. In the exterior part of the building the glass used must be of non reflective type.
2. RWH facility must have a storage capacity of at least 15 days fresh water demand and must be used to ease out the stress on common water supply.
3. Adequate precautions for disaster management should be inbuilt in the plan.
4. Carbon foot print of the project should be reduced to the maximum extent possible.

**The appraisal report is enclosed as Annexure 5**

**Item No.42.06**      **Environmental clearance for IT Building Cum Campus (Technocity Project) in Sy. Nos. 8 (part), 9(part), 10 (part) at Andoorkonam Village and Panchayath, Thiruvananthapuram Taluk Thiruvananthapuram District, Kerala by Sri. Vijayaraghavan Gopala Pillai for Suntec Infrastructure Pvt. Ltd.**

(File No. 372/SEIAA/KL/2612/2014).

Project Proponent : Sri. Vijayaraghavan Gopala Pillai, Director, Suntec Infrastructure Pvt. Ltd.  
EIA Consultant : Environmental Engineers & Consultants Pvt. Ltd

In view of the amendment to Para (3) of appendix V of 2006 notification issued vide SO 3067 dtd 1.12.2009 the Committee reviewed its decision taken in its 40<sup>th</sup> meeting.

On Verification of the concerned Maps, the Committee found that the proposed area doesn't fall under CRZ. In such matters KCZMA is the authority for final clarification. In this particular case, the Committee observed that the CRZ status will not have any bearing on the appraisal.

After discussion the Committee decided to **recommend for issuance of EC** subject to normal conditions in addition to following specific conditions.

1. Considering the fragile nature of strata, cutting is proposed on the western side and must be done by forming benches.
2. To the extent possible excavated earth must be used internally and not taken out of the premises. Top soil must be preserved for landscaping.
3. The capacity of RWH should be in accordance with the rules in this regard.
4. Adequate precautions for disaster management should be inbuilt in the plan.
5. Carbon foot print of the project should be reduced to the maximum extent possible.

**The appraisal report is enclosed as Annexure 6**

**Item No.42.07 Environmental clearance for Housing Project Sobha Silver Sand at in Sy. Nos. 492, 493, 495/1, 495/2, 495/3, 495/4, 496, 497, 498, 499, 500, 501/1, 501/2, 502, 503/1, 504/1, 504/2 at Nadama Village, Kanayannur Taluk, Ernakulam District, Kerala by M/s Sobha Developers Ltd.**

(File No. 412/SEIAA/KL/2912/2014)

Project Proponent : Mr. Ramakrishnan Prabhakaran, DMD,  
M/s Sobha Developers Ltd

EIA Consultant : Environmental Engineers & Consultants Pvt. Ltd

In view of the amendment to Para (3) of appendix V of 2006 notification issued vide SO 3067 dtd 1.12.2009 the Committee reviewed its decision taken in its 39<sup>th</sup> meeting .

The Committee observed that even though the applicant in the Application indicated that the area is outside CRZ area, the area support mangroves and the salinity is also on the higher side indicating tidal activity and hence SEIAA may obtain recommendations from the KCZMA before issuance of EC. After detailed discussions the Committee decided to **recommend for issuance of EC** along with following specific conditions over and above the recommendations, if any, by the KCZMA.

1. Since the area is subjected to saline intrusion provision for dependable source of water should be provided.
2. The facilities to be adopted for waste water treatment should be adequate so as not to cause contamination in the nearby water bodies.
3. Should provide sufficient setback from the extra high tension line passing through the proposed area.
4. Adequate precautions for disaster management should be inbuilt in the plan.
5. Carbon foot print of the project should be reduced to the maximum extent possible.

Sri John Mathai, Member, SEAC suggested a reappraisal based on the revised conceptual plan incorporating the recommendation of KCZMA. Committee considered the suggestion but it was observed that even if the recommendation of the KCZMA is to downsize the project there will not be any reason to dilute the specific conditions prescribed above. Hence the above suggestion was overruled by a majority.

**The appraisal report is enclosed as Annexure 7**



**Item No.42.09**      **Environmental clearance for proposed Cancer Hospital Project in Sy. Nos. 272/2, 3, 4A1, 4A, 4A2, 4B, 297/1B, 265/1B2, 266/2,4 268/2, 267/1B, 279/3, 273/4 in Chloor Desam of Poolokode Village, Chathamangalam Panchayath, Kozhikode Taluk, Kozhikode District, Kerala of M/s Cancer and allied Ailment Research (CARE) Foundation.**  
(File No. 547/SEIAA/KL/3960/2014)

In view of the amendment to Para (3) of appendix V of 2006 notification issued vide SO 3067 dtd 1.12.2009 the Committee reviewed its decision taken in its 39<sup>th</sup> meeting.

The Committee decided to **recommend for issuance of EC** stipulating the following specific conditions in addition to the general conditions for non-mining projects

1. The entry available in the southern side should be developed so as to minimise the traffic congestion in future
2. The proponent should ensure that, effluent is not discharged without proper treatment and adequate care is taken to reuse the treated effluent in the proposed project site itself.
3. The proponent should give proper provision for harvesting of storm water and reuse of waste water.
4. As far as possible, constructions have to be carried out without disturbing much of the biodiversity. While developing the site, the proponent should be careful to minimise the impact on floral and faunal ecology. The green belt available on the boundary of the project site shall be retained.
5. Adequate precautions for disaster management should be inbuilt in the plan.
6. Carbon foot print of the project should be reduced to the maximum extent possible.

**The appraisal report is enclosed as Annexure 9**

**Item No.42.10**      **Environmental clearance for P.K Das Institute of Medical Sciences project in Sy. No. 59/3A, 59/3B, 59/4A, 59/4B, 58, 57/1A, 57/1B, 57/3, 60/1, 60/12, 59/1, 57/3, 60/10, 60/11, 60/5, 54/8, 61/5, 55/7, 57/2, 57/ 4, 6/3, 6/1 and 6/6 at Vaniyankulam Village, Vaniyankulam, Palakkad District by Adv. Dr. P. Krishnadas**  
(File No. 554/SEIAA/KL/4089/2014)

Project Proponent      :      Adv. Dr. P. Krishnadas  
EIA Consultant         :      KITCO Ltd., Cochin

In view of the OM F No. 19-2/2013-IA III dated 9-06-2015, the Committee reviewed the decision taken in its 40<sup>th</sup> meeting. On verification of proposal it is found that the existing hospital has a built-up area of 16838.86m<sup>2</sup> and they have proposed expansion with additional built up area of 75555.67m<sup>2</sup> making the total built up area of the project to be 92,394.53m<sup>2</sup> and hence the Committee decided to defer the item for field visit by a subcommittee consisting of Dr. Jayson and Dr. Harikumar.

**Item No.42.11**      **Environmental clearance for Proposed building for Infrastructure Kerala Limited (INKEL) at Angamaly in Sy. Nos. 266/5 at Vadakkumbhagom Village and Angamali Panchayath, Aluva Taluk, Ernakulam District, Kerala by Sri. Premkumar Sankara Panicker for M/s INKEL Ltd.**  
(File No. 555/SEIAA/KL/4090/2014)

Project Proponent      :      Sri. Premkumar Sankara Panicker  
EIA Consultant        :      KITCO Ltd., Cochin

In view of the amendment to Para (3) of appendix V of 2006 notification issued vide S.O. 3067 dtd 1.12.2009 the Committee reviewed its decision taken in its 40<sup>th</sup> meeting.

It is understood from the project proponents that they have already commenced the construction works after the submission of the application and to that extent there is a violation. Hence the Committee decided to **recommend issuance of EC** after finalisation of violation procedure subject to the general conditions in addition to the following specific conditions.

1. The Project Proponent shall ensure that the space is leased out only to those industries which are capable of disposing the waste generated by them without polluting the land, water and air in the vicinity.
2. The capacity of RWH facility should be not less than the provisions in the KPBR/KMBR.
3. Storm water discharge should be properly planned.
4. Adequate precautions for disaster management should be inbuilt in the plan.
5. Carbon foot print of the project should be reduced to the maximum extent possible.

**The appraisal report is enclosed as Annexure 10**

**Item No.42.12**      **Environmental clearance for proposed Malabar Medical College Hospital and Research Centre project in Re Sy. Nos.18/1, 4, 5, 19/2A, 2B, 21, 23, 24 in Ward No.1 of Atholi Grama Panchayath and Re Sy. Nos. 8/4, 11, 13, 14/2 in Ward No.12 of Balussery Grama Panchayath at Modakkallur Village, Koyilandy Taluk, Kozhikode District, Kerala by Sri. V. Anil Kumar, M/s Anjaneya Medical Trust**  
(File No. 666/SEIAA/EC4/5181/2014)

Project Proponent      :      Sri. V. Anil Kumar, Chairman  
EIA Consultant        :      En-vision Enviro Engineers Pvt. Ltd.

In the view of the OM F No. 19-2/2

013-IA III dated 9-06-2015 the Committee reviewed the decision taken in its 40<sup>th</sup> meeting. The Committee found that the proposal requires EC, if the total built up area of the hospital is > 20,000m<sup>2</sup>. On verification of proposal it is found that the total built up area of the project is 1,13,807.94m<sup>2</sup> and hence the Committee decided to defer the item for field visit by a subcommittee consisting of Dr. Khaleel Chovva and Dr. Harikumar.

*Minutes for the 42<sup>nd</sup> SEAC meeting held on 2<sup>nd</sup> July, 2015*

**Item No.42.13**      **Environmental clearance for Proposed “Sutherland ITES Campus” at KINFRA Hi – Tech Park by Sutherland Global Services in Sy. Nos. 321/1 at Thrikkakara North Village, Kanayannur Taluk, Ernakulam District, Kerala by Sri. VBNNV Prasad for M/s Sutherland Global Services**  
(File No. 734/SEIAA/KL/ 07 /2015)

Project Proponent       :       Sri. VBNNV Prasad, Associate Vice President- Finance  
EIA Consultant           :       ABC Technolab Pvt. Ltd., Chennai

In view of the amendment to Para (3) of appendix V of 2006 notification issued vide SO 3067 dtd 1.12.2009 the Committee reviewed its decision taken in its 40<sup>th</sup> meeting .

Thus the Committee decided to **recommend for issuance of EC** subject to general conditions in addition to following specific conditions.

1. A provision for independent water source from the project area itself should be provided.
2. Standard operating procedure for disaster risk reduction should be followed right from the designing stage itself.
3. Parking space shall not be less than what is prescribed in the KPBR/KMBR.
4. Adequate precautions for disaster management should be inbuilt in the plan.
5. Carbon foot print of the project should be reduced to the maximum extent possible.

**The appraisal report is enclosed as Annexure 11**

**Item No.42.14**      **Environmental clearance for Proposed expansion of hospital buildings for Lakeshore Hospital & Research Centre at Ernakulam in Sy. Nos. 325/1,2,3,4, 327/3,4,5,6,7at Maradu Village and, Kanayannur Taluk, Ernakulam District, Kerala by Sri. Dr. Philip Augustine for Lakeshore Hospital & Research Centre at Maradu village, Ernakulam.**  
(File No. 740/SEIAA/KL/62/2015)

Project Proponent       :       Dr. Philip Augustine, Managing Director  
EIA Consultant           :       ABC Technolab Pvt. Ltd., Chennai.

The Committee reviewed its decision taken in its 40<sup>th</sup> meeting in the light of the amendments to Para (3) of appendix V of 2006 notification issued vide MoEF notification S.O. 3067 dated 01.12.2009 which reads ‘Where a public consultation is not mandatory, the appraisal shall be made on the basis of the prescribed application Form I and EIA report, in case of all projects and activities other than item 8 of the schedule. In the case of Item 8 of the Schedule, considering its unique project cycle, the EAC or SEAC concerned shall appraise all Category B projects or activities on the basis of Form 1, Form 1A and the conceptual plan and make recommendations on the project regarding grant of EC or otherwise and also stipulate the conditions for EC’

The Committee observed that the present proposal is a revision of the plan already approved by Maradu Municipal Corporation. The approval was for construction of a building of 4515.04m<sup>2</sup> built-up area. At the time of approval there was already a built-up area of 20520.68m<sup>2</sup>. Therefore, when the addition was sanctioned, the proponent should have obtained an EC and the authority which accorded sanction should have insisted for the same. To that extent, this is a case of violation for which SEIAA may take appropriate action. Meanwhile, since the proposed area falls under CRZ, the recommendation of KCZMA may be obtained.

**Item No.42.15 Environmental clearance for proposed Govt. Medical College Idukki in Sy. Nos. 161/1 in Cheruthoni of Idukki Village, Vayathope Panchayath, Thodupuzha Taluk, Idukki District, Kerala of Dr. PGR Pillai, Special Officer for new Medical Colleges, Government of Kerala.**

(File No. 748/SEIAA/KL/221/2014)

Project Proponent : Dr. PGR Pillai, Special Officer  
EIA Consultant : M/s KITCO Ltd

In the view of the OM F No. 19-2/2013-IA III dated 9-06-2015, the Committee reviewed the decision taken in its 40<sup>th</sup> meeting. On verification of proposal it is found that the existing hospital has a built-up area of 11019.75m<sup>2</sup> and they have proposed expansion with additional built up area of 39158.60 m<sup>2</sup>. The total built up area of the project is 50178.35m<sup>2</sup> and hence the Committee decided to defer the item for field visit by a subcommittee consisting of Dr. Keshav Mohan and Sri. S.Ajayakumar.

**Item No. 42.16 Environmental clearance for removal of ordinary earth in Sy.no. 98/1, 76/2B, 84/1 and 98/2 at Kuruvattoor Village and Panchayath, Kozhikode Taluk, Kozhikode District, Kerala by Sri Ramesan, P. (File No. 800/SEIAA/EC4/2098/2015)**

The Committee appraised the proposal based on the details provided by the applicant and found that the earth is required for the construction of NH 17 which serves the larger public interest. Taking the above factor into consideration the Committee decided to consider the application as a special case and allow maximum depth of 2 metres stipulated by MoEF and CC in case of ordinary earth. The earth is proposed to be extracted from four plots and after giving allowance for setoffs, the Committee decided to recommend for issuance of EC for 45000m<sup>3</sup> of earth by forming terraces by limiting the maximum depth to 2meters.

**The appraisal report is enclosed as Annexure 12**

**Item No. 42.17**      **Environmental clearance for removal of ordinary earth in Sy.no. 109/1A1 at Nellikode Village, Kozhikode Corporation, Kozhikode Taluk, Kozhikode District, Kerala by Sri Ramesan, P. (File No. 801/SEIAA/EC4/2099/2015)**

The Committee appraised the proposal based on the details provided by the applicant and observed that the earth is required for the construction of NH 17 which serves the larger public interest. Taking the above factor into consideration, the Committee decided to consider the application as a special case and allow maximum depth of 2 metres stipulated by MoEF and CC in case of ordinary earth. The area proposed is small in extent and after giving allowance for setoffs, the Committee decided to **recommend for issuance of EC** for 1500m<sup>3</sup> of earth by forming terraces by limiting the maximum depth to 2meters.

**The appraisal report is enclosed as Annexure 13**

**Item No. 42.18**      **Any other Item**

The Committee observed that it should have a clear picture about the proposals pending for appraisal. For taking appropriate action in all such applications, a **complete** list of the same indicating the dates of pendency and reasons for pendency needs to be presented before the SEAC. The Committee requested the Secretary to prepare such a list and make available to the Committee at the earliest.

The meeting ended at 2.00 pm with vote of thanks to the Chairman and Members.

Shri. C.S. Yalakki IFS  
(Secretary SEAC)

Shri. V Gopinathan IFS (Rtd)  
(Chairman SEAC)

**Members present in the meeting**

1. Sri. V Gopinathan  
(Chairman SEAC)
2. Sri. John Mathai
3. Dr. Keshav Mohan
4. Dr. Hari Krishnan K
5. Dr. Oommen V. Oommen
6. Sri. P. Sreekumaran Nair
7. Dr. George Chackacherry
8. S. Ajayakumar
9. Dr. Khaleel Chovva
10. Sri. C.S. Yalakki IFS